REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 9 and 17 and respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Thus, Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-18, 21-24, 28-30, 34-36, 40-42 and 46-51 remain pending. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed March 4, 2010. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Interview Summary

A telephonic interview was conducted on June 7, 2010 between Examiner Ludwig and Attorney Akmal. During the interview, embodiments of the present invention and the Rosenoff reference were discussed. No agreement was reached.

Applicant appreciates the time and effort taken by Examiner Ludwig to review Applicant's present application and discuss the pending claims and the cited prior art.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-18, 21-24, 28-30, 34-36, 40-42 and 46-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over previously cited U.S. Patent No. 7,003,719 ("Rosenoff") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,121 ("Melen").

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

> A method performed by a computer system, comprising:
> storing an electronic version of a paper, the electronic version being displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper;
> at a first location within the electronic version, detecting a reference to a second location, wherein the second location is external to the likeness of the paper, and wherein the detected reference at the first location is associated with a portion displayed in the likeness, and wherein the detected reference at the first location is other than alphanumeric characters of the associated portion of the likeness; and
> in response to the detected reference at the first location, embedding a hyperlink within the associated portion displayed in ~~of~~ the likeness, wherein the displayed portion of the likeness is identified to the user as being associated with the hyperlink, the hyperlink is selectable by a user in association with the displayed portion of the likeness to cause retrieval of content from the second location and the displaying of content retrieved from the second location on the display device in association with the portion of the likeness.

However, Rosenoff and Melen fail to teach all the limitations of Claim 1. In fact, Rosenoff teaches away from such limitations.

Rosenoff "defines hyperlinks including at least a portion of the marked text" (*See*, Rosenoff, Abstract). In Rosenoff, "An exemplary implementation of the method finds and marks legal citations--for example, references to court opinions, government laws, and legal treatises--and automatically defines each hyperlink to include at least a portion of a marked legal citation" (*See*, Rosenoff, col. 2 lines 4348).

Unlike Rosenoff, Claim 1 requires "at a first location within the electronic version, detecting a reference to a second location, wherein the second location is external to the likeness of the paper, and wherein the detected reference at the first location is associated with a portion displayed in ~~of~~ the likeness,-and wherein the detected reference at the first location is other than alphanumeric characters of the associated portion of the likeness; and in response to the detected reference at the first location, embedding a hyperlink within the associated portion displayed in ~~of~~ the likeness, wherein the displayed portion of the likeness is identified to the user as being associated with the hyperlink, the hyperlink is selectable by a user in association with the displayed portion of the likeness to cause retrieval of content from the second location and the displaying of content retrieved from the second location on the display device in association with the portion of the likeness"

As it seems that Melen does not remedy the deficiencies of Rosenoff, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1, similar Claims 9 and 17 and their respective dependent Claims 2, 5-8, 10, 13-16, 18, 21-24, 28-30, 34-36, 40-42 and 46-51

Conclusion

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-18, 21-24, 28-30, 34-36, 40-42 and 46-51. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

An extension of 1 month is requested and a Notification of Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 with the appropriate fee is enclosed herewith.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

Sprinkle IP Law Group
Attorneys for Applicant

Ari Akmal
Reg. No. 51,388

Date: June 17, 2010

1301 W. 25th Street, Suite 408
Austin, TX 78705
Tel. (512) 637-9220
Fax. (512) 371-9088